



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,352	04/06/2001	Harry Edward Mussman	12128-146001	2995

35657 7590 01/24/2005

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
PATENT DOCKETING
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER
90 SOUTH 7TH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901

EXAMINER

KIZOU, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,352

Applicant(s)

MUSSMAN ET AL.

Examiner

David Odland

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/08/01, 11/12/02
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 10-16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennefeld et al. (EP 1014633), hereafter referred to as Bennefeld, in view of Yamamoto et al. (USPN 4,991,204), hereafter referred to as Yamamoto.

Referring to claims 1, 10 and 19, Bennefeld discloses a directory gatekeeper for performing routing of calls through a plurality of gateway resources (a root gatekeeper that routes packets through a packet network (see figure 4A-5B and abstract)), the directory gatekeeper comprising one or more communication devices providing access to a plurality of resource management gatekeepers (the root gatekeeper can communicate with the gatekeepers that perform resource management (see figures 4A-5C and abstract)) each resource management gatekeeper associated with one or more of the plurality of gateway resources (each gatekeeper has an associated RLMU which is used for load balancing (see figures 4A-5C and abstract)), and a processor operable to receive a request through the one or more communication devices (the root gatekeeper receives requests (see column 12)). Bennefeld does not disclose the process of storing route lists in memory and selecting alternate routes based on the request. However, Yamamoto discloses a system wherein switching nodes receive call-connection requests and in response perform a look up of alternate available routes to use (see abstract, figure 1 and column

Art Unit: 2662

24)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Bennefeld because having alternate routes would make the system more reliable. Note, regarding claim 10, Yamamoto discloses that the switch when it receives the call-connection request searches a list of available routes for the call and then connects the call, thereby informing the call-connection requester that the chosen route is available (see abstract, figure 1 and column 24)). Note regarding claim 19, Yamamoto discloses sending a busy signal to the call-connection requester when there are no available routes (see figure 4)) but Bennefeld does not disclose the system is implemented using a computer readable medium. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Bennefeld system in this manner because the developmental costs of a software implementation are less than that of a hardware based implementation. Furthermore, software is easier to upgrade than hardware.

Referring to claim 2, Bennefeld discloses one of the one or more communication devices provides access to a packet-based network (the root gatekeeper is coupled to the Internet (see figure 1)).

Referring to claim 3, Bennefeld discloses the packet-based network is an Internet protocol (IP) network (the root gatekeeper is coupled to the Internet (see figure 1)).

Referring to claim 4, Bennefeld discloses the one or more communication devices provides access to the public switched telephone network (PSTN) (the root gateway is coupled to the PSTN (See figure 1)).

Referring to claims 5 and 15, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose that performing alternate routing of calls by identifying one or more candidate

Art Unit: 2662

routes and selection available ones of the routes. However, Yamamoto discloses that the switch when it receives the call-connection request searches a list of available routes for the call and then connects the call, thereby informing the call-connection requester that the chosen route is available (see abstract, figure 1 and column 24)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Bennefeld because making sure the alternate routes are available alternate routes would make the system more reliable.

Referring to claim 6, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose performing alternate routing of calls if none of the candidate routes are available, sending a response to the received further includes: request indicating that the request can not be completed. However, Yamamoto discloses sending a busy signal to the call-connection requester when there are no available routes (see figure 4)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Bennefeld because doing so would make the system more user friendly by indicating to the user that the line cannot be reached.

Referring to claims 7 and 16, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose selecting a candidate route from the one or more candidate routes includes selecting the least cost route as the candidate route. However, It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Bennefeld because choosing the least cost route would thereby reduce the costs of routing the call, thereby improving efficiency and reducing resource usage.

Referring to claims 11,12,20 and 21, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose that the request includes a telephone number and a numbering plan

Art Unit: 2662

area (NPA). However, since the communication between the subscribers of Bennefeld are using telephones and they can be in different area codes (i.e.. NPA's), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into the system of Bennefeld because the use of these numbers are established standards, thus the system would conform to them.

Referring to claims 13 and 22, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose the request to initiate a call is an H.323 admission request (ARQ) message. However, H.323 ARQ messages are established standardized messages. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into the system of Bennefeld because doing so would allow the system to conform to an established standard.

Referring to claims 14 and 23, Bennefeld discloses that each route in the list of routes is associated with a resource management gatekeeper (the gatekeepers manage all system resources and the routing of information through the routes of the system are directly related to the systems resources).

3. Claims 8,9,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennefeld in view of Yamamoto and further in view of Harada et al. (USON 5,956,339), hereafter referred to as Harada.

Referring to claims 8,9,17 and 18, Bennefeld discloses the system discussed above. Bennefeld does not disclose that the selecting includes selecting a candidate route from the one or more candidate routes at a predetermined ratio. However, Harada discloses a system wherein a

Art Unit: 2662

routing manager (RMG) selects routes based on a backup ratio (see column 18 lines 31-33)).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into the system of Bennefeld because the backup ratio gives an indication of the resources available in case of failure thus considering them when making the route selection would improve the reliability of the Bennefeld system. Note regarding claim 9, all the routed in Bennefeld have a substantially equal likelihood of being chosen (i.e. they are either chosen or not, thus there is a 50% chance of being chosen).

Conclusion

4. The following prior art, which is made of record and not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. U.S. Patent Number 4284852 to Szybicki et al.
- b. U.S. Patent Number 4679186 to Lea.
- c. U.S. Patent Number 5058105 to Mansour et al

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Odland whose telephone number is (571) 272-3096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2662

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

deo

December 2, 2004



JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER